

WINDLE'S SPEECH.

(Continued from Page 4)

your son that he shall no longer keep company with a certain young lady. Issue your imperial prohibition—decree in thunder tones, and if that boy amounts to a tinker's dam, he will have that girl or die. If he does not amount to a tinker's dam, I congratulate the girl. The thing in man that makes prohibition a failure, makes manhood a success. If you could make prohibition a success, you would make man a failure.

Where did your boy get the natural impulse to resist and defy prohibition? He got it from you. You would do the same thing and so would I. Did we get it honestly?

Go back with me to the Garden of Eden. Start at the beginning. Unless the Darwinian theory is true, Adam and Eve were the first of the human race. They were innocent and perfect. Unlike us, they did not have long lines of ancestors, reaching backward to dark ages with inherited weakness, wickedness and sin.

God placed these perfect people in a beautiful Eden, where there was not a single excuse for going wrong. The birds sang night and day, and the flowers bloomed on every hand, and when the storm struck the trees they made music like a thousand harps.

But one day there stood in their presence—not an anti-Saloon League leader with his self-assumed authority—not a detective with a 44 in his hip pocket—but there stood in their presence the Omnipotent God who flung a hundred million blazing suns into space and holds the Universe in the hollow of his hands. This Omnipotent God, the embodiment of all authority, said to our ancestors, these perfect people:

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat—"

Up to the point of freedom all trees looked alike to Adam and Eve. They had no special curiosity concerning the fruit of any particular tree, but when the Lord added:

"But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it lest ye die," the curiosity of these perfect people was aroused.

What was the effect of this first prohibition decree issued by the Supreme Authority to our perfect ancestors in Paradise? Why, when Adam and Eve found that the Garden of Eden had gone prohibition, it was a question of who would get to the tree first, and Eve beat Adam to it. She had to go some, too, believe me.

Our opponents may argue that all this proves that God was a Prohibitionist or that he made a mistake. It proves nothing of the kind.

This story in the Bible is given to us to illustrate the folly, fallacy, and inevitable failure of prohibition when applied either to the appetites or the natural rights of man.

Had God been a prohibitionist He would have built a fence around the tree. Had God been a prohibitionist, He would have prohibited the snake.

Our opponents will endeavor to prove that prohibition is not contrary to nature by pointing out the evils of intemperance. It would be just as reasonable to attempt to justify infidelity, by proving the existence of hypocrisy. They will tell you that the devil is opposed to prohibition. This is not true. Prohibition gave the devil his first opportunity.

A Menace To Manhood.

Prohibition is not only contrary to reason and opposed to nature, but it is a menace to the development of true manhood. It is only by exercising freedom of choice that one can develop the faculty of self-control. Prohibition is destined to rob men of this freedom, hence it would prevent the development of manhood's highest faculty.

You can no more develop moral force without exercising personal liberty than you can develop physical strength without exercising your muscles. You can no more develop the faculty of self-control without freedom of choice, than you can develop mental power without exercising your brain.

If you want to make your boy a weakling, tie him to your prohibition apron strings. Having prevented by lack of exercise the proper development of the faculty of self-control, your boy is liable to be wrecked by the first storm that overtakes him at sea. It may not be the rock of intemperance, upon which his ship is wrecked, but some other. He may be driven upon the shoals and reefs of greed, jealousy, lust or revenge, and you may some day hear his helpless cries that rise above the roar of the angry billows that engulf his hopes forever.

The time must come in life of each and every boy when he must enter the arena and single handed and alone do battle with the wild beasts of temptation and passion. Train him for this fray. Build up within him a will power that will save him in the crisis of his life. When no fond father or loving mother or policeman is near.

The faculty of self-control—will power which prohibition weakens—can do more to save your boy in the battles of life than all the muzzles and legal straight jackets the ingenuity of fanaticism can invent.

We condemn prohibition—we reject it—not because we want to sell liquor, but because prohibition in practice is a menace to the development of real manhood. Of course, our opponents will attempt to refute my arguments by painting a pitiful picture of some poor drunkard. But it is far more important to develop real manhood in the masses than to sacrifice their development in a futile effort to save a few weaklings.

An insult To intelligence. Prohibition is not only a menace to the development of self-control, but it is an insult to your intelligence.

I want to ask you a simple question—is it a compliment or an insult for a man to step up to you, look you in the eye and say:

"My friend, you are a weakling; you are incapable of choosing for yourself between good and evil; you need a legal muzzle to keep you from becoming a hog? I have selected myself to act as your guardian."

This is exactly what prohibition says to every man and every woman.

The whole prohibition contention is based upon the idea that the citizen is a child and needs a guardian. Every dry parade exemplifies this conception and illustrates the child idea of citizenship. There will be a float containing a number of little children in charge of a grown person or a guardian who is there to see that the kids do not gouge each other's eyes out with their banners and tin horns.

When a man fights the world for a job and earns a dollar, that dollar is his by every law of God and man. If he spends it wisely he reaps a reward. If he spends it foolishly he suffers the consequence. But this experience is necessary to the development of his manhood. Of course, it may sometimes work an injury to his wife and children, but nothing of value is ever won or retained without suffering to some. They also suffer when he makes a bad investment in land, stocks or inventions, or puts his money in a bank that fails. But this right inherent in all men is paramount to the rights of a wife and children who happen to be exceptions. No other man can tell you what you shall do with your money and not insult your intelligence. I made that statement in a speech one time and a minister sprang to his feet and shouted at the top of his voice:

"How about a man's wife?" And I yelled back at him in the same tone: "You let that man's wife alone!"

When he recovered from the shock, I said to the gentleman:

"If you have a wife and children of your own, you have a lifetime job. It is an insult to any other man, rich or poor, for you to assume for one moment that he does not love his wife and children as well as you love yours, or is just as capable of taking care of them."

The child idea of citizenship is absurd. I reject it. For 138 years we have from Fourth of July platforms declared the American citizen to be a sovereign—a king. The king does not need a guardian, and no man who admits that he needs one is competent to act as the guardian of another.

If any man is to act as my guardian I want him to get his appointment in a court of record, according to law, and give a good and sufficient bond for the faithful performance of his duty in attending to my business.

Take your choice between the child idea and the king idea of American citizenship. We who oppose prohibition look upon every citizen as a sovereign. As sovereign citizens of this republic we can boast a coat of arms like the crowned heads of the old world. But our coat of arms shows no barbaric design emblematic of despotism and oppression. But it shows on the left a dove hovering over the broken fragments of human and the shattered shackles of slavery; on the right the Vulcan of labor beating swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks. In the center an eagle cleaving the clouds, bearing in its beak the motto, "Equal Rights to All," and in his talons a streamer inscribed with the legend, "Right is Might."

Such was the conception of our fathers who established the nation, who suffered at Valley Forge and died at Bunker Hill. This idea inspired their valor on every battle field of the Republic. They embodied this ideal in the constitution of the United States, in the Declaration of Independence, and emblazoned it in letters of living light on the flag of stars.

This idea is worth fighting for—worth dying to save. We oppose prohibition, not because we want to run saloons, but because prohibition is an insult to manhood. Our opponents will try to prove that prohibition is not an insult to your intelligence by denouncing the white slave traffic, or some other evil which they will attempt to connect with the liquor traffic. It would be just as reasonable to attempt to prove that water does not run down hill by affirming that a round square cheese exists in the moon.

Destructive of Human Equality.

Prohibition is not only an insult to manhood, opposed to nature, and contrary to reason, but it would destroy the equality of human rights. According to the genius of our institutions, you carry as much sovereignty under your hat as I carry under mine. In all our rights we are equal. If this is not true, the Republic is based upon a lie.

I have no more authority to say that you shall not drink a glass of beer than you have to say that I shall drink it. Neither can submit to the other and maintain equality of rights. But here is the main reason why you cannot afford to let any man tell you what you shall not drink to-day. You cannot be sure but what he will change his mind to-morrow. He might tell you to-day that you shall not drink something you want. To-morrow, having changed his mind, he can make a monkey of you by demanding that you drink something you don't want. This is the ridiculous position in which prohibition places a man. Reason, honor and pride rebel at the very idea. Justice and liberty forbid.

Before you sacrifice the equality of human rights upon the altar of prohibition, consider the price our fathers paid for this deathless principle. Consider the value of this idea of human equality. If you want to know how much it has been worth to the world—worth to the human race—measure the progress made since 1776 with all the progress made by mankind from the dawn of civilization to the day our fathers proclaimed that all men are created equal. They did not mean by equality that all men are created equal physically, for they are not. Nor did

they refer to moral equality. Some are good, some are bad, and some are as the Englishmen say, "just 'alf and 'alf." They did not mean that all men are created equally mentally, because some are wise and some are otherwise. Our fathers meant by that declaration that all men are equal with reference to their inalienable rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and a voice in their own government. I mean by a voice in their own government the right to govern themselves collectively as States and Nations, and to govern themselves individually in the matter of temperance. I also want to emphasize the fact that by life our fathers did not mean mere existence. You can have existence and wear a prohibition muzzle. You can have existence and be in jail. You can have existence and be a slave, but you cannot have liberty and prohibition.

When our fathers declared that all men are created equal, this old world was in darkness. Might made Right. Every ship of state was a pirate craft. Every ensign of sovereignty a bloody butcher, while Freedom was chained to the dark, dungeon floors of despotism, her white breast stained with blood. At the declaration that all men are created equal, light broke through clouds, of darkness and despotism, prison bars melted away, shackles fell from bruised and bleeding limbs, and the human race rose from its knees, looked the sun in the face, and commenced the mightiest march of progress ever witnessed by the gods. Show me the automobile, the flying machine, the moving picture, wireless telegraphy, or any great invention that excites the admiration of gods and men, and I will show you the children of Freedom and Human Equality.

Show me the rack, the stake, the dungeon, the stocks, the thumb screw, or any implement of torture or despotism, and I will show you the children of prohibition. We oppose prohibition not because we want to get drunk, but because prohibition would destroy the equality of human rights and turn the dial of Progress backward a thousand years.

Based Upon a False Premise.

Prohibition is not only destructive of human equality, but its philosophy rests upon a false foundation. The whole contention is based upon a false premise. When you argue from a false premise you may be as wise as Solomon, but your conclusions will be erroneous.

There are two men in the liquor business. One in front of the bar, the other behind. Which one of these men is responsible for the liquor traffic? One is the cause and the other the effect. If the man behind the bar is the cause, the liquor business can be destroyed by voting him out of business. But on the other hand, if he is the effect and the man in front of the bar the cause, voting him out of business will only change the channel through which the demand is to be supplied. I admit that you can vote the man behind the bar out of business, but I deny that you can vote the man in front of the bar out of business. You can vote a town dry, but you cannot vote a man dry.

If the traffic in liquor is evil, which I deny, you could not cure the evil by treating the effect instead of the cause. The man in front is the cause, the liquor dealer the effect. Our opponents will make a strong argument against the evils of intemperance. But every argument against the abuse of liquor is an argument for temperance, not prohibition. Our dry friends are so hard for an argument in defense of prohibition that they are compelled to use argument against the abuse and seek to make it applicable to the use of liquor. Their logic is absolutely unsound and utterly absurd. You cannot apply any argument against the use of a thing that is applicable only to its abuse.

When a physician treats the effect instead of the cause of your sickness, you call him a quack. Still I heard of a doctor like that who once saved a man's life. The poor devil sent for him and the doctor would not come.

We reject prohibition not because we want to run a brewery, but because the whole contention rests upon a false premise. Our dry friends will try to prove that the prohibition contention does not rest upon a false premise because some men drink to excess, some saloons are bad, certain people who drink are poor and others commit crimes. This is like trying to establish the innocence of a murderer by convicting some other man of theft. His logic is unsound and utterly absurd.

An Immoral Proposition.

Not only does the whole prohibition and Anti-Saloon League contention rest upon a false premise, but it is an immoral proposition. I know they claim to have a monopoly on all morality, integrity and Christian virtue connected with this controversy, but I am here to spoil that monopoly. When they have said, "This is a moral question," they meant that they were on the moral side of the proposition and all who oppose them stand for the immoral side of the question. Most prohibitionists are good people, and when they realize the immoral character of their crusade, I feel certain they will abandon it. Prohibition is shown to be an immoral proposition because it is destined to confiscate the liquor man's property without indemnity. You cannot pray loud enough to make that right. You cannot pile up majorities big enough to make that right. The principle of confiscation without indemnity is exactly the same morally whether applied to bank property or brewery property, saloon property or farm property. It is not the kind of property or the character of the owner that determines the morality of this act. When the property or business in question has been a factor in the legitimate commerce of the world for ages, the morality of confiscation is determined by the indemnity paid for the property taken or the investment destroyed.

When a State kills a tubercular cow, she may be a menace and a nuisance, but it pays the farmer for

the property it destroys. This act stamps as immoral the proposition to destroy the investment of any man without the payment of a just indemnity.

Some socialists argue that it would be right to confiscate the property of capitalists, on the ground that the working classes created the wealth now in possession of the rich, and were robbed. They hold that it would be morally right to take this property without paying indemnity. They have a better moral argument than the prohibitionists, because prohibitionists cannot claim that they created the wealth now in possession of the liquor men unless they confess to having imbibed more booze than we have given them credit for.

If you take my purse, that is theft. If you take my life, you call it murder. But when you take my liberty, that is prohibition. The brave in every age of the world's history have been willing to give up their property for their lives, and then surrender their lives for liberty. If it is immoral to take my purse, a thing of little value, it cannot be moral to take the thing of highest value—a man's liberty.

We reject prohibition not because we want to make drunkards, but because prohibition is an immoral proposition.

Our opponents try to prove that prohibition is entirely moral because the United States abolished slavery without indemnifying the slave owner. To make that argument good they'll have to show that there is no moral difference between selling a human being into slavery against his will, and selling a willing man a scuttle of suds. He will have to prove that there is no moral difference between owning a case of beer and a chattel slave.

Undermines the Basis of Morality.

Prohibition is not only an immoral proposition, but it strikes at the basis of all morality. This is a serious charge, and one that should be weighed with careful consideration. No principle or movement ever had a more damaging charge brought against it. If I sustain this indictment, honest prohibitionists will be compelled to abandon their position. In determining the morality of a question of this kind reason is the highest authority.

Instead of relying upon a dogmatic assertion to prove my charge I want to ask this audience two questions. The only possible answer will reveal the basis of all morality:

"Could God credit you with morality for doing something I compel you to do?"

I hear every person in this audience answer no.

"Could God credit me with morality for leaving something undone which you prevented me from doing?"

Again the verdict is unanimous and the answer is no.

These questions and answers prove that freedom of choice, or personal liberty, constitutes the basis of all morality. In seeking to destroy freedom of choice and drive a dagger into the heart of personal liberty prohibition undermines the basis of all morality.

You cannot have morality without personal responsibility. You cannot have personal responsibility without personal liberty. This is the rock upon which the prohibition ship breaks to pieces.

When you can prove that water does not run down hill you will be able to show that prohibition does not undermine the basis of morals.

We antagonize prohibition not because we want to run a distillery, but because it strikes a blow at the basis of all morals. The drys will attempt to show that prohibition is moral; that it is right in principle because God said "Thou shalt not kill." Unlike making, buying, drinking and selling liquor, killing is never proper. Drinking becomes evil through the abuse of a natural right. It is not wrong per se. Murder is wrong. You must drink to excess to become a drunkard. It is not necessary to kill to excess in order to become a murderer. Killing involves another man's life. Whether you kill is everybody's business. It is not everybody's business whether you take a drink. God prohibits the thing that in itself is wrong—that does not become evil by abuse or excess. He prohibits nothing that becomes evil by excess. In every such case temperance, regulation, is the divine order.

Powerless as a Remedy for Intemperance.

Prohibition is not only an immoral proposition, tending to undermine the foundation of morals, destructive of human equality, and contrary to reason, but it is powerless as a remedy for intemperance.

This is shown by the nature of the case and the character of the law in question. Temperance is a virtue that cannot be impaired by law. Like love, it cannot be promoted by force. When it comes to binding love a spider's web is as potent as a triple chain of steel.

Law may forbid a thing that is wrong, per se, but it cannot prevent the abuse of a good thing.

There are only two remedies for intemperance: Moderation and total abstinence. Each belongs to the realm of personal liberty. Neither can become personal virtues unless self-imposed and self-enforced.

You can take man away from liquor, but you cannot take liquor away from man.

A law designed to prevent a man from drinking requires constant repression for its enforcement. Before such a law could become a remedy for intemperance it would be necessary to establish an absolute despotism upon the ruins of liberty. With a bayonet at every man's breast we would make a fine exhibition on the Fourth of July singing:

"My Country, 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty."

To enforce such a law you would need one man to stand over another with a club all the time. It would also be necessary to have a third watch the other two, for if anybody laid down a club somebody would get a drink.

In closing the legitimate saloon you convert the beer drinker into a whiskey

drinker. This is a poor way to promote true temperance, or save the drunkard.

Prohibition in trying to prevent a man from buying a drink makes it possible for him to buy a drunk. A glance at the record will convince every reasonable person that prohibition wherever tried has utterly failed to prevent the consumption of liquor. On the other hand, the consumption has increased despite the fact that in the last sixty years more than 100,000 saloons have been abolished and one-half the geographical territory of the United States placed under prohibitory law.

The official records show—and I defy successful contradiction—that in 1850 when the first great prohibition movement started, the annual per capita consumption of alcoholic beverages in the United States was a fraction less than four gallons. Ten years later it had risen to nearly six and one-half gallons. This encouraged the drys, and they made a desperate struggle for ten years more. At the end of that time the consumption increased to seven and three-quarter gallons. Of course, this aroused still greater enthusiasm among prohibition workers, and in 1880 consumption reached ten gallons per capita. Inspired by their wonderful progress prohibitionists redoubled their diligence, and, notwithstanding they abolished thousands of saloons, the consumption of liquor ten years later had increased to fifteen and one-half gallons.

About this time the drys organized the Anti-Saloon League. They enlisted a vast number of preachers and many churches in their crusade, but despite the abolition of legitimate saloons the per capita consumption of alcoholic liquors reached seventeen and one-half gallons in 1900.

This seemed to inspire them with boundless zeal, and with one grand onslaught they placed city after city, county after county, State after State in the dry column. Notwithstanding this fact the latest internal revenue report shows that, instead of consuming four gallons per capita, as in 1850 when prohibitionists started to save us from the demon rum, we are now consuming twenty-four gallons per capita.

Prohibitionists by making one-half the geographical territory of the United States dry have increased the consumption of liquor from four to twenty-four gallons per capita. Great God! Now, if the drys can prove that the more a man drinks the less apt he is to become intoxicated they can show that prohibition is a remedy for intemperance. If they succeed in demonstrating that proposition I agree to prove that the less a man drinks the more drunken he becomes.

While prohibition cannot promote temperance, it does breed sneaks, liars, hypocrites, perjurers and petty criminals any one of which is a greater menace to manhood, a greater menace to morality than the worst saloon that ever existed.

We oppose prohibition not only because it is a failure, but because in trying to suppress one vice by force you create five others more deadly than the one you would destroy.

We have already shown that prohibition is wrong in principle. This is true whether applied to one hundred people or one hundred million. When a thing is fundamentally and morally wrong even success can not make it right.

A Menace to the Church.

Prohibition it not only powerless as a remedy for intemperance, it is also a menace to the church—to true religion.

The Federal census reports show that in wet New York 43 per cent of the people belong to church. In wet Rhode Island 54 per cent of the people belong to church. In prohibition Maine less than 30 per cent of the people are church members, and in dry Kansas less than 29 per cent are affiliated with any church. In the northern group of States, to which Kansas and Maine belong, the average percentage of church membership is 44.

The reason for this condition in prohibition States is apparent to all who think.

Men naturally resent the efforts of ministers to interfere with their private affairs.

They refuse to go to church to hear a prohibition harangue instead of a gospel sermon.

They decline to support a minister who appeals to the law of force instead of the power of love.

They know that every preacher who calls upon the police to save men discredits the religion of Jesus Christ.

The spirit of intolerance manifested by advocates of prohibition drives people away from the church. Frequently the members are told by the pastors to vote dry or resign their membership. Unable to convince men by reason that prohibition is right the drys frequently resort to the social or business thumb screw to compel others to accept their views. People who honestly differ with them are denounced as children of hell.

It is such actions as these that drive men away from the church, away from God and Christ, and accounts for the fact that in prohibition Maine and Kansas people have less use for the church than in any other States in the Union.

Christians should oppose prohibition not because they are particularly interested in the perpetuity of the liquor business, but because prohibition wherever tried has not only failed to help, but has invariably injured the cause of true religion. The opposition may attempt to belittle our concern for the church, but they must remember that a majority of all the people who profess to be Christians are now and always have been opposed to prohibition.

Un-Christian in Character.

Prohibition is not only a menace to true religion, but it is contrary to the divine order.

I can prove this charge without

opening the Bible. Freedom of choice is the divine order. God could not accept the worship of legal automata. Before your songs and prayers can be anything but hollow mockery they must come through free lips, from willing hearts. God could write a message to-night across the sky in letters of fire, and the whole human race would fall on its knees. That would put all the ministers out of business in a jiffy. It is not God's way. He might kill the devil, but He doesn't.

Theologians have been telling us for nearly two thousand years that "God made man able to stand, though free to fall." Did they tell us the truth? If not, how can we believe them now? We know that they told the truth, because the doctrine of personal liberty is in harmony with the divine order.

I now call your attention to the Bible, accepted by all Christians as the revealed will of God. I shall give you a few passages which will show the position of the Deity on the question of using intoxicating liquors.

In Genesis, 14th chapter, 18th verse we read:

"And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the Most High God."

Strange that the Most High God did not inform His priest that it was wrong to set wine—an intoxicating drink—before his guests.

In Numbers, 15th chapter, 10th verse, we read:

"Thou shalt bring for a drink offering a hin of wine for an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord."

From this we learn that intoxicating wine as an offering was not only acceptable, but pleasing to God.

In the 9th chapter of Judges, and 13th verse, we read:

"And the vine said unto them, should I leave my wine which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the tree?"

If the use of wine is wrong how could an evil thing be pleasing to God?

In the 9th chapter of Ecclesiastes, 7th verse, we learn that as a reward for their devotion and loyalty God gave His people the right to drink. It says:

"Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God now accepteth thy works."

Instead of abolishing personal liberty God here grants His people the right to drink as a reward for righteousness.

In Isaiah, chapter 62, verse 8, Almighty God solemnly pledges Himself to protect His people in their right to drink the wine for which they labor. This verse reads:

"The Lord hath sworn by His right hand, and by the arm of His strength, surely I will no more give thy corn to be meat for the enemies; and the sons of the stranger shall not drink thy wine for which thou hast labored."

We see by this passage that after all this conflict is a fight between prohibitionists and God.

The prohibitionists swear by Holston and Bill Sunday that the use of intoxicating liquors shall be abolished. God has sworn by His right hand and by the arm of His strength that no man nor set of men will deprive His people of personal liberty on the drink question.

I shall now proceed to show by the example of Christ that prohibition is un-Christian in character.

In the 7th chapter of Luke, 33d and 34th verses, Jesus contrasts His habits with the habits of John the Baptist. He says:

"John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say he hath a devil."

"The Son of Man is come eating and drinking and ye say behold a gluttonous man, a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

The drys may deny that Jesus meant to say that He drank what John did not drink. But unless this language means that John was a teetotaler and that Jesus was a temperate drinker of intoxicating wine it means absolutely nothing. So much for the example set by the ideal moral character of all ages.

Every man who holds that it is morally wrong to use wine discredits Christ. It never can be Christian to prohibit a thing that Jesus did. But Jesus not only drank wine, but made it for others to drink.

In the second chapter of St. John we have the story of Christ's first miracle. The host at the wedding feast of Cana provided wine for his guests, but the supply gave out before the feast ended. There arose a demand for more wine. The sainted Mother of Christ called his attention to this demand.

There has never been on this earth a more appropriate opportunity for making a prohibition speech. Confronted by this demand, had prohibition been a Christian principle Jesus would have condemned the host for providing the wine in the first place.

Had prohibition been in harmony with the divine order Jesus would have reproved the guests for drinking.

This is what any prohibitionist would have done, which shows how they and Christ differ on this question. What was the answer of the Son of God to the demand for an intoxicating beverage? He converted water into wine to supply the demand. Had He been a prohibitionist He would have converted the wine into water at the beginning of the feast instead of converting water into wine at the end of the feast.

Nobody denies but what He performed a miracle to supply this demand, but prohibitionists tell you that the wine He made was not intoxicating.

Fortunately there was a witness present that nobody could fool on grape juice.

In order to determine whether or not the wine Jesus made was intoxicating.

(Continued on Page 7)